

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

PRIORITY

Enclosed for filing is a certified copy of priority document 101 07 231.7 as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action states the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Further, the Office Action states that in Claim 2, lines 1-2, "the first and second electric contact faces together comprise an earth terminal" is not disclosed in the specification and drawings. The Examiner's attention is directed to Claim 2 which has been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, and 5-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki (U.S. Pat. No. 5,492,388) in view of Pandit, et al. (U.S. Pat.

No. 6,234,850). Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki (U.S. Pat. No. 5,492,388) in view of Pandit, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,234,850, and further in view of Hirmann (U.S. Pat. No. 6,535,394). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki (U.S. Pat. No. 5,492,388) in view of Pandit, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,234,850), and further in view of Hauske, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,623,214). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki (U.S. Pat. No. 5,492,388) in view of Pandit, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,234,850), and further in view of Kellison (U.S. Pat. No. 4,642,964). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's attention is directed to amended independent Claims 1, 6, 8, and 12. The claims have been amended to clarify that the weld nut according to the teachings of the present invention define a cavity between the top side for first electrical contact and the annular weldment area. This feature is a cavity which is distinguishable from the threaded bore. While the Applicants acknowledge that the Kawasaki reference teaches the use of a weld nut in a configuration which permits the transmission of electrical energy therethrough, Kawasaki does not teach the features as claimed. With respect to the second primary reference, Pandit, et al., Applicants note that the reference simply teaches an electrical terminal arrangement for supporting a standard hex nut. In this regard, the reference teaches a cup shape bracket which prevents the rotation of the nut with respect to a piece of equipment (11). Further, the nut is allowed to float within the bracket. No mention is made of welding the structure to the piece of equipment.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 30 - 2004

By: 
Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

CAE/smb